

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

The abstract of the disclosure stands objected to because “it is a repeat of the claims and does not describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.” MPEP § 608.01(b). Applicant respectfully notes that the abstract, while based on the claims, is not a repeat of the claims. In contrast, the present abstract is in narrative form and is properly within the range of 50 to 150 words. In this regard, the abstract does not borrow the form or legal phraseology of the patent claims. Additionally, Applicant respectfully notes that the abstract generally illustrates, in as brief of a manner as possible, the organization and operation of the apparatus as is required by the MPEP. Because Applicant’s abstract is within the parameters of MPEP § 608.01(b), it necessarily is sufficient to describe the disclosure to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The title stands rejected as being not descriptive. Accordingly, the title has been amended such that it is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The aforementioned amendment corresponds to the election of Invention I as explained below. The amended title reads “METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR ENLARGING AN OUTPUT DISPLAY ON A DISPLAY”.

Claims 5-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5, 7 and 19 have been amended to provide antecedent basis for various claim terms and to correct other inconsistencies. A complementary amendment has been made in claim 1. Claims 13 and 18 have been cancelled without prejudice. Because claims 6, 8-12, 14-

17 and 20-22 were rejected merely because of their dependency on claims 5, 7, 13, and 19, Applicant respectfully submits the claims for immediate allowance.

Additionally, the Office Action includes a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 wherein the Examiner has grouped claims 1-12 and 14-22 as Invention I while claim 13 is categorized as Invention II. Applicant respectfully notes that claims 13-18 have been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully elects to continue prosecution with respect to the remaining claims in Invention I.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/20/06

By: Christopher J. Reckamp  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(312) 609-7500  
FAX: (312) 609-5005